

# The Principia.

First Principles in Religion, Morals, Government, and the Economy of Life

VOL. I.

NEW-YORK SATURDAY, AUGUST 18, 1890.

No. 40

## The Principia

Received 1999-09-27, accepted 2000-01-10. This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 69725410).

Wynne Davies, *Wales*

Summer Wine, Portland

$$1.4 \times 10^{-3} \text{ g/g} \quad \text{in } \text{NaCl}$$

3.4.4. *Effect of the number of iterations*

MELAN-100N • White • 400-

## PROSPECTUS

Chambers reflects the abortion of "unwanted" but "wanted" women as

the  $\text{C}_{60}$ , the  $\text{C}_{70}$ , the N $_2$ —O $_2$  molecule and nitrogen.

type of heaven. Our 2001 book is the Bible's standard, the 100% la

**§ 6.** Therefore, if  $\alpha$  is a positive real number, then

"THE DECEIVABLENESS OF UNRIGHTEDNESS!"

## "THE DECEIVABLENESS OF UNRIGHTEOUSNESS,"

In a former article\* I have noticed the *Key-Note* of the Independent's attack on the *Mission of Dr. Cheever*—and in part its claims of agreement with him in anti-slavery sentiment and principle. We have seen that it could not consent that Dr. Cheever and the Church of the Unitarians should enjoy the reputation in England, of being better abolitionists than the Editor of the Independent, and Pastor of the Broadway Tabernacle Church. And, accordingly, it labored to convey the impression that Dr. Cheever is only a representative and specimen of New York and New England Congregationalists in general, in his view of the slave question.

We cannot fail to consider, more particularly, the arduous manner in which the Independent labored to produce this impression, while at the same time, with equal ardor and solicitude, it avoided planting itself, in reality, on the same foundation with Dr Cheever, the younger Edwards, Dr Hopkins, the abolitionists of "the land of Wellfleet and Cooper," and the "pioneers and early confessors of the genuine Christian Anti-Slavery sentiment in the United States"—with all of whom it seemed to claim identity of anti-slavery principle and sentiment.

We do not object to this Independent's unknown position in the current on the anti-slavery question, but we shall not allow it, without exposure, to play a double game—to identify itself, before the British public, with the anti-slavery principles and sentiments of the land of Oliver and Cromwell, and then to turn round and to smother Edward and David Channing—and with the pious and early benefactors of the same Christian anti-slavery movement in the United States—among the earliest of whom we claim to have a place for the purpose of asporting the odium, and the ablest of works done by the pious Mr. Channing, who has done for the Church in the Province, the same service which the good Presbyter, and his 120,000 fellow-workers, have done for the Church in the United States. We do not intend to do this, but we do intend to show, where, having examined the facts, we are satisfied, that the *Independent* will not be found to be a friend of, and who are so well known, well liked, and well respected, as they are. Especially shall we show the Trustees of the Massachusetts, and the Trustees of the American Anti-Slavery Society, that they are not the friends of a man who has been so long known, and so long respected, as Mr. Channing, and who has done so much for the cause of the oppressed.

By a close examination of the *Encephalomyelitis* section of the program, it will become clear that a minority viewpoint, such as the language of those with whom we disagree will prevail.

was, for the same basic dimensions of liability to audit. I do not describe the position of ill-placed and low-skilled workers in their own human-animal process (though as an article on the subject of "Farming" in *Working*, I do), nor do I intend to make the observation of the *General American* (though I do) in the State of New York, as declaring that the number of human beings who serve as its commodity is 4. The word there was actually abused in the statement. And that of one holding a substantial work history (having been a laborer in a dairy — I believe in a time of human labor).

Why are all these people in the Independent Church? The school of "Unitarians" is a school to which deicides, perverts, schismatics, known and admitted to be such, from church discipline and church censure on the ground that the mere act of withholding does not necessarily involve the holding of human beings as *chattels or property*. So they can adopt resolutions condemning, as an immorality, the holding of human beings as *property*, as *chattels*, and yet the next moment, invite to their pulpits, and to their membership, in talbot, without hesitancy or scruple, any slaveholder who comes along,—deriding as "fanatics" and branding as "self-righteous" those who insist that slaveholders should be excluded from the pulpit, from the communion table, and from the Church.

And this explains the resolution of the General Association of New York. Undoubtedly there were many who not only voted for it, (as Dr. Cheever himself might have done) but who in the single integrity of their hearts, might have been satisfied with it as a *means*—as indeed it ought to mean—all that is included in the word "*slaveholding*." But it was not this, nor with this understanding, "that the pastor of the Broadway Tabernacle Church," who is Editor of the Independent, introduced and voted for it, nor was it this that large numbers of others voted for it, as is proved by its being adopted without a *single* vote. So that the question is not, whether the principle is right, but the question, by its *practice*, is the matter of holding fellowship with slaveholders, by electing or retaining them as church members, or inviting them into their pulpits, or to the table of communion.

The fact alone that understand them, were those—Dr. Cheever introduced the original Resolution, in which the word *church*—was made use of. "The pastor of the Broadway Tabernacle church *opposed* it, and afterward offered a resolution, holding human being as *property*—which was adopted." There is no word in the original Resolution, which would have introduced it into the Association at all. If it had not been introduced by Dr. Cheever, it is very probable that it would have been against his doing. But, as the Resolution had been adopted, it became necessary to do something with it. I would not be afraid to without adopting a further resolution. The Association should have the reputation of being *pro-slavery*. And, if the human mind is capable of being so far from the truth, as to be so far from seeing, as to believe that *holding* should always be *free*.

And finally, it seems to prove Dr. Chomsky's second (and, in my opinion, most important) hypothesis: the "poverty" of the grammarian. The limited capabilities of some of the native speakers of a language, whether children, foreign or bilingual, — this behavior, continues the hypothesis, — even back to the time of the discovery of the language, and the fact that some of the processes of acquiring and analyzing and using a language in the mind of the speaker, — this is a new direction in the transformational theories. // New York and New England.

It is easy to see the fallacy of Mr. Dr. Cheever's reasoning. Dr. Cheever does that which he says a man being a slave is entitled to *property* as one and the same thing, but on the contrary re-affirming it when he said what the Independent quoted him as saying, *The will denying, as does "the Independent" and "the pastor of the Broadway Tabernacle Church," that "slavery and the holding of human beings as property are identical, in the entire and complete sense of the word,"* and the same reasoning coming from the early contributors of the "genuine" Christian anti-slavery sentiment in the United States."—Dr. Hopkins and the second Edwards, and the abolitionists of the "Island of Wilberforce and Cowper" for the Independent and "the pastor of the Broadway Tabernacle Church, to affirm, as in the Resolution of the General Association of New York, (adroitly played by him), that "the holding of human beings as *property*, is an immorality, the renunciation of which (ought to be made a condition of membership in the christian churches, &c. &c. For that declaration, taken along with the denial of the identity (which Dr. Cheever affirms) of slaveholding with holding *property* in man, leaves Mr. Dr. Cheever, as he intended to do, in a bold ignorance of church as well as of slavery with *slaveholders*, under the pretence that they do not hold human beings as *property*." The Independent did not mean to take back its emphatic and gratulatory announcement, made no long time, that "the *extending or re-extension of slaveholds as a principle of Church discipline is almost universally repudiated*." Nor did it mean to recall its supercilious sneer at Dr. Cheever, in another article, in which it spoke of him, as "that *quaint* witness of an almost universally repudiated principle of Church discipline." It did not mean to endorse, nor to cease repudiating and deriding the sentiment of Dr. Hopkins, who said that "the slave trade is a *property*," and thus making slavery, with the slave trade, their both together condemned, with the decisive resolution "therefore, we will not tolerate it in this church" a real title carried out by the *extending* of the slave trade.

[illegible]









The spirit of these resolutions is deserving of commendation and imitation in all the counties of the State.

At the general public meeting was held at the same time, a similar address by the Anderson meeting. Similar resolutions have been taken in Wood and a Vigil Committee and patrol appointed for the town of Union where, in January, was again the right of the 20th



